

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LOUIS PATRICK MORALES,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B211113  
(Super. Ct. No. 2008034149)  
(Ventura County)

Louis Patrick Morales appeals from the judgment (order granting probation) entered on his guilty plea to one count of possession of a controlled substance, a felony. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a).) Appellant was a passenger in a car stopped for a traffic violation. Police learned of a warrant for his arrest and took him into custody. A subsequent search of his person yielded one gram of methamphetamine. After appellant pleaded guilty, the trial court granted probation on the condition, among others, that appellant participate in a court approved drug treatment program. (Pen. Code, § 1210.1.) With respect to the prior offense that led to appellant's arrest, the trial court noted that a 30-day jail sentence imposed in that matter was "deemed served[.]" and that appellant's probation in that matter was "revoked and reinstated." Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal; his request for a certificate of probable cause was denied.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, counsel filed a brief raising no issues. On December 24, 2008,

we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished to raise on appeal. On January 23, 2009, we received a letter from appellant in which he contends that the trial court should also have resolved his prior offense and that he did not receive effective assistance from his trial or appellate counsel.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorneys have fully complied with their respective responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.) There was no error in the disposition of appellant's prior offense. The trial court revoked and reinstated appellant's probation in that matter and deemed his jail term to have been served. The record also does not support appellant's claim that his appointed counsel provided ineffective representation. There is no reasonable probability that a result more favorable to appellant could have been obtained under any circumstances.

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION.

YEGAN, Acting P.J.

We concur:

COFFEE, J.

PERREN, J.

Colleen Toy White, Judge  
Superior Court County of Ventura

---

California Appellate Project, under appointment by the Court of Appeal,  
Jonathan B. Steiner, Executive Director and Richard B. Lennon, Staff Attorney, for  
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.